



18w
PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Hideki MATSUDA et al.

Group Art Unit: 2851

Application No.: 10/687,808

Examiner: C. Mahoney

Filed: October 20, 2003

Docket No.: 117557

For: IMAGE PROCESSING SYSTEM, PROJECTOR, PORTABLE DEVICE, AND IMAGE
PROCESSING METHOD

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the February 16, 2005 Office Action, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

Applicants appreciate the Office Action's indication that claims 2, 7 and 17 include allowable subject matter.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. §102(e) Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-14, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,846,081 to Mochizuki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Mochizuki does not qualify as prior art under any section of 35 U.S.C. §102, because Applicants' priority date proceeds the filing date of

Mochizuki. The U.S. filing date of Mochizuki is July 18, 2003, and was patented in the United States on January 25, 2005. However, the present application has a U.S. filing date of October 20, 2003 and claims priority from JP 2002-352247 filed December 4, 2002. The priority was claimed by a certified copy filed October 20, 2003 and was acknowledged by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in the February 16 Office Action. An accurate English-language translation is filed herewith. As the instant claims are fully supported by the priority document, Mochizuki is not prior art to the present application, and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Thus, because Mochizuki does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, the rejection must be withdrawn. Accordingly, withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. §102(b) Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 3-5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,483,537 to Mayer, III. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts on page 3 that Mayer discloses a "keystone distortion correction means for converting the coordinates of the light of the predetermined shape in the sensed area into coordinates for projection in a spatial light modulator of the projection section, and correcting keystone distortion by mapping coordinates of an input image into the projection coordinates," as recited in claim 3 and as similarly recited in claims 8, 12, 14 and 18. See, e.g., Mayer, Figure 7 and col. 3, lines 42-59. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

Mayer only discloses that the geometric discrepancies are resolved by a suitable process where any size, parallax, skew, curvilinear distortion or keystoning by remapping elements of the camera image 44 to corresponding x/y analysis array registers. See, e.g., Mayer, col. 3, lines 49-52. Nowhere does Mayer disclose the claimed distortion correction

means that converts "the coordinates of the light of the predetermined shape in the sensed area into coordinates for projection in a spatial light modulator of the projection section," as recited in claim 3, and as similarly recited in independent claims 8, 12, 14 and 18.

Because Mayer does not disclose the claimed keystone distortion correction means, claims 3, 8, 12, 14 and 18, and the claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by Mayer. Accordingly, withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. §103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mochizuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,305,805 to Liebenow and U.S. Patent No. 6,733,138 to Raskar. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Mochizuki does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and thus, does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Liebenow is cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing a portable projector and portable computer connected to the projector. Further, Raskar is cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing a sensing means that is connected to the computer. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Liebenow and Raskar do not remedy the deficiencies of Mochizuki.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 5, 10 and 15 would not have been rendered obvious by Mochizuki in view of Liebenow and Raskar. Accordingly, withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

ATTACHMENT:
English Translation of JP 2002-352247

JAO:RBI/cfr

Date: April 25, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--